NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III. SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1834. NO. 18.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY
T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or $2,50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (East of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 132 Chesnut-street, Philadelphia.
Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

Original.

UNIVERSALISM vs. REVIVALISM.—NO. 4.

I shall in the present number close what I have to say concerning Mr. Ingersoll's lecture against Universalism. I regret that this Rev. gentleman, like all others whom I have ever heard publicly speak against 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' either very much mis-apprehended the views of Universalists, or intentionally traduced them. His endeavor to rivet on the prejudices of his hearers the notion that 'Universalists believe in no punishment for sin,' and other sentiments equally as false in fact as they are inapplicable to the denomination, evinces a large share of ignorance in relation to the doctrine assailed, or a sad want of 'the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.' Candor demands, truth requires, and christianity entreats that in the discussion of opposing religious sentiments we should present them as they *are*, not as they may appear to the disordered view of prejudice and passion, or as they come to us from the busy tongue of Rumor. Let our opposers in one combined phalanx array themselves for the 'dreadful encounter' against *Universalism*, (not a thing of their own creation,) and we have nothing to fear; we believe it to be the truth of Heaven, and should we be overpowered in our defence of it, what will be the conquest of the victor? Why he will have proved a doctrine true, which his 'heart's desire and prayer,' and the most ardent efforts of his life are opposing with zeal and fortitude. But to our subject.

Mr. I. says that 'the law of God is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' &c.—that we may go to the utmost bound of our imagination in God's universe till we are lost in the immensity of His glory, and *there* this law will be binding upon us.' This I readily admit; this is the law of of God; it is a *good* law, and no change of place or circumstances can destroy the obligation of men to obey it. But says Mr. I. 'there is a *penalty* to this law—and that penalty is hell-prison. God being infinite, there must be a penalty corresponding to his dignity.' By turning to Deut. vi., 5, I find these words, 'Hear O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.' But where is Mr. I.'s 'penalty or hell-prison.' It is not there. This is God's law as it was declared to Moses most certainly, and it was afterwards repeated several times, and not a word is said about 'hell-prison.' It may be well for Mr. I. to call to mind Rev. xxii, 18, 'If any man shall *add*,' &c.

When our Savior was asked, Matt. xxii, 36 'which is the great commandment in the law?' he answered, 'thou shalt love the Lord thy God,' &c. But here again nothing is said about 'hell-prison.' A wise and just law-giver when he issues a law to his subjects, publishes at the same time the penalty to be inflicted for its violation. Were it otherwise, were the subjects of this law left ignorant of the penalty, we could hardly 'justify the ways' of the law-giver in inflicting the penalty. God's law enjoins upon us the duty of loving Him. True it is that if we fly to 'the utmost bounds of our imagination' we cannot go where the law is not in force. But we shall look in vain to find that the penalty annexed to this law is 'endless torments in hell-prison.' David says, Ps. cxvi, 1, 'I love the Lord because he hath heard my voice and my supplications. Gracious is the Lord and righteous, yea, our God is merciful.' The Psalmist was not constrained to love God on account of the penalty; he knew nothing about the 'pit of endless despair.' He also frequently expresses his love for God's law. 'O how I love thy law;' but we have no intimation given that he loved it because the penalty to it was 'hell-prison.' The apostle John says, 'We love him (God) because he first loved us;' not because the penalty is 'endless pain.' Indeed, we think the human mind must undergo a change in its feelings, and be so organized as to be governed by opposite motives from what it now is, before it can be moved to the exercise of love by apprehension of ceaseless torments.

Mr. I. affirms, that '*Paul was not a Universalist.*' To ascertain the truth or falsity of this assertion we have only to allow Paul to speak for himself; when he is heard, then judge ye.—In his first Epistle to Tim. ii, 3, after exhorting that prayers, &c. be made, he says, 'For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time.' Now if Paul believed that there was a 'hell-prison' for a large portion of the human race, this was very singular language to use. If a Partialist preacher were to speak thus, he would be obliged to explain himself, or his hearers would take it for granted that he was 'bound up in the delusion' of Universalism. In Rom. v, 18, 19, 'Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' Here the 'free gift' is just as extensive as the 'condemnation,' and the 'many' who '*shall be made righteous*,' are the same 'many' who were made sinners. Paul says in his epistle to the Hebrews, ii, 9, "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, &c. that he by the grace of God should taste death for *every* man.' Here it will be perceived that salvation is by the grace of God,' and to ascertain the extent of that grace we refer to his epistle to Titus, ii, 11, 'For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,' or as the passage may be rendered, 'for the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared.' These are a few of the passages written by the great apostle which, to my mind, go to establish the doctrine of the final 'restitution of all things.' Why did Paul use these expressions if he taught the notion of endless suffering? Yea more, if he believed in the existence of 'hell-prison,' why did he not mention it *once*, at least, in his writings?

Mr. I. affirms also, 'Paul was not a Unitarian.' As respects this I am not disposed to contest the point as one of very great importance. If the apostle's own testimony is to be relied on, he held to the doctrine of a world's reconciliation to God, and whether he was a *Trinitarian* Universalist, or a *Unitarian*, is of small moment compared to the question, Is there an awful 'hell-prison' for any of Adam's race? At any rate, Paul no where says 'triune God,' or 'three persons in one God.' He says, in his epistle to the Ephesians iv, 6, 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.' If God is '*above all*,' there cannot be a 'person' who is 'equal in power and glory' to Him. In 1 Cor. xv, 27 28, he says, 'But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.' Here it is plain that the Son is to be subject to his Almighty Father, the one only, undivided, and living God, and this could not be if the Son be God himself.—Paul says again, Phil. ii, 9, 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him (Christ) and given him,' &c. If Christ be God himself, he could not be *exalted*, in the sense here used. From these and various other considerations which I need not name, I am inclined to think that Paul *was* a Unitarian.

As Mr. I. labored hard throughout his sermon to show that Felix trembled because Paul told him about 'hell-prison,' he comes to the conclusion that 'Felix was convinced of christianity.' By this I understand Mr. I. to mean, that Felix was convicted of the 'awful reality that there is a hell-prison for the wicked.' I think I have shown that Mr. I.'s premises, viz. 'Felix trembled because Paul told him about hell,' are totally false, and his conclusion 'that Felix was *convinced* that there is a hell is also false. His hypothesis stands thus: 'Felix trembled,' therefore he was convinced of the nature, and existence of 'hell-prison.' Now let us examine it: 'Now as he (Jesus) walked by the sea of Gallilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; and Jesus said unto them, come ye after me, &c. and straightway they forsook their nets and followed him; And when he had gone a little further thence, he saw James, the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, and straightway he called them, &c. and *they* went after him, Mark i, 17, 20. Were those men 'convinced of christianity?' Yes. But did they *tremble* because they heard 'hell-prison' with all its appurtenances of torture proclaimed? No They heard no such thing. Were the 'three thousand souls' converted under Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost 'convinced of christianity?" Yet Peter said not a word about 'hell-prison,' as we are informed, (read the 2d chap. of Acts, and see.) Was Zaccheus 'convinced of christianity,' when Jesus told him, 'This day is salvation come to this house,' Luke xix, 9, yet here again no mention is made of Mr. I's 'hell-prison.' Acts xi, 21, 'And the hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed and

turned unto the Lord.' Were these 'convinced of christianity?' Did they hear any thing about hell-fire? If they, did, the inspired penman from some unaccountable cause has concealed the fact. I have cited these instances to show Mr. I. who comes nearest to the apostolical method of preaching, *himself*, or they who he arrogantly affirms '*preach a lie.*' In closing, I hope I may be permitted to say, while candor and conscience admonish me to express my firm conviction, that Mr. I. is in error, I nevertheless hail him as a brother, an heir of the great salvation promised to Abraham and revealed in that 'better covenant' of grace and truth. After all that I have said respecting his lecture, I feel no 'root of bitterness' springing up to expel from my bosom that 'charity which suffereth long, which endureth all things.' And although he reproachfully charges my sect with 'the sin of going from this place of worship with *light* countenances and refusing to have a *prayer*-meeting after church,' I will 'enter my closet' and pray that 'the kingdom of God may come;' that it may go on purifying the heart, enlarging the soul, elevating the understanding, and sanctifying the will of man, till the 'devil and his works shall be destroyed, and God be all in all.'—Amen. B. B. H.

Original.

MESSRS. EDITORS—In your paper of December 28th, I find some further remarks addressed to me by Z. G. Although I have little hope of saying any thing to satisfy his mind, yet *courtesy* leads me to make a few remarks.

1. It is impossible for me to believe, that all things for which I am unable to account must be supernatural; and yet this seems to be contended for by your correspondent. He refers to the signs and sights which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. But he should recollect, these are mentioned in scripture, and are expressly connected there with that awful destruction. Now, if he could point out any part of the bible which spoke of the late shower of fire, and connecting it as a sign of some fearful event about to happen, I shall also believe it in a similar way. But that all signs in the heavens are supernatural I cannot admit. "Thus saith the Lord, learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them." Jer. x, 2. But does he suppose, because I will not be like the heathen, that I have no faith in a "superior agent," who upholds and governs all things? He sadly mistakes, for I believe a sparrow cannot perish independent of God.

2. Nor am I able to see, here "things for which we cannot account," must be placed on a footing with "miracles recorded in the bible." Z. G. seems to decide about both in the same way. Does he indeed place the case of Col. Gardnier on a par with Christ's miracles? If Dr. Dodridge and others, believed it a miracle, others have been of a different opinion, and accounted for it in a different way. Col. Gardnier might be deceived, but how could so many be deceived in the open and numerous miracles of Christ? At any rate, Z. G. should hesitate to call that a miracle for which he is unable to account, for some other persons may account for it rationally. What then becomes of his miracle? It is no miracle to them, and ceases to be a miracle to him, the moment he knows how to account for it. There are thousands of things, for which children and even men cannot account for, but are easily accounted for by other persons. There are abundance of miracles, but they are only such, for lack of better information.

3. A considerable part of Z. G.'s piece is taken up about dreams. I have said in my former reply, that I dream but seldom, and hardly ever dream any thing worth telling. To this however there is perhaps one exception, and it is the only exception which I remember in the whole course of my life. I shall tell it, and shall be obliged to Z. G. if he will interpret my dream, whether it was supernatural, or what I am to make of it. If it does not edify your readers generally, I think it will amuse some of the ladies. I fell asleep in my bed as usual, and dreamt as follows:

I found myself walking in the street of an unknown town. The wind blew very fresh, and from the appearance of the streets a great quantity of rain had lately fallen. My walk was before the wind. But on the opposite side of the street, I perceived an elegantly dressed lady coming in the opposite direction, and requiring considerable force to brace herself against the wind. She was so tightly laced in the middle, that her waist seemed not much more in circumference than a man's wrist. As to shape, she looked more like a walking hour glass than a human being. While I was looking at her odd shape, in an instant her upper half dropped off and fell to the pavement. But to my surprise, the under half walked on, unconscious to all appearance of what had happened. The upper part which had dropt off, cried out to the under part to stop, but being without eyes or ears paid no regard to the request. The under part walked on, until it arrived at a part of the pavement which was interrupted by a cross street. Having no eyes to see this interruption, it stumbled down, and fell into a quantity of water occasioned by the rain which had lately fallen. My deep surprise, was changed to a burst of laughing, at seeing one half of her ladyship in the gutter, and the other, some ten or twenty rods behind her lying on the pavement, crying out, stop, stop. My burst of laughter awoke me, and behold it was a dream.

I now beg leave to ask Z. G. if he thinks there was any thing supernatural in this dream? Does he think it was given me for any special and important purpose? How would he interpret this dream? He might use what arguments he pleases, but they would be of no use to me, for I never had a dream in my life time, for which I could so rationally account, and verifies the words of Solomon—"A dream cometh through the multitude of business." Eccles. v, 3. It is this. On the afternoon of the day preceding my dream, I attended a lecture in the State House, which was delivered by Dr. Warren before the Institute of School Teachers. The Dr. pointed out, in a very plain and pointed manner, the pernicious effects resulting from strait stay lacing. It was injurious to the general health of females; it distorted other parts of their bodies; and if it was not abandoned, would introduce a generation of dwarfs. In the midst of his lecture a lady fainted in the gallery, which some attributed to the very thing the Dr. was denouncing. It would be difficult, if not impossible to persuade me, that this dream did not originate from this lecture. But how it was manufactured in my brain while asleep, I am not wise enough to say. This I must leave for Z. G. or some person who understands the science of dreaming better than I do.

I have told the above dream, as a dream, a number of times since by way of amusement. But I do not find, that I dream the oftener, or any better for telling it. This does not improve my dreaming talents in the least. I conclude therefore, that either I do not possess such talents, which are capable of improvement, or what people often say is not true—"that he who tells his dreams is sure to dream." But I must not tell this dream any more, seeing it is going to be printed, and will probably meet with some important explanation. If it could be so interpreted, as to lead all the ladies to abandon the practice of turning themselves into the shape of hour glasses, I should think I had not dreamed in vain. But alas! I have never been able to dream myself into any thing that is good, and how can I expect to dream them out of what is evil.

To conclude. Does Z. G. seriously think, dreams, signs, sights, etc. adds to his present comfort and holiness, or inspires him with the hope of immortality? Perhaps he thinks this, but he must permit me to think, the bible sufficient without these. My attachment to the bible must be greatly decreased, before I can give heed to such things; but am highly favored in not being troubled with them, or having any desire after them. If Z. G. cannot do without them, I do not feel the want of them. May I always give heed to God's word, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, and let others do as they please. As I have not the faculty of dreaming, or of seeing strange sights, it should seem I am naturally incapable of instruction in such sciences. I may therefore bid Z. G. a final adieu.

W. BALFOUR.

Charlestown, Jan. 8, 1834.

Original.

METHODIST HYMNS.

MESSRS. EDITORS—Looking over the Methodist collection of Hymns the thought involuntary presented itself to my mind, why do christians condemn as absurd and heretical sentiments held by others, which they themselves hold forth in their prayers and hymns of praise, as the truth of God—as being consistent with his revealed will and purpose? For example, I quote the few following verses from the Methodist Hymn Book. In the 179th Hymn, 2d 3d and 4th verses, we find language to which every sincere Universalist would respond Amen, while the Methodist would deny the sentiment, if coming from a Universalist, and call it heresy—the doctrine of the devil, and he who advocated it, a preacher of lies. Ascribing praise to Christ, it reads:

He ever lives above,
For me to intercede,
His all redeeming love,
His precious blood to plead.
His blood atoned for all our race,
And sprinkles now the throne of grace.

Five bleeding wounds he bears,
Receiv'd on calvary;
They pour effectual prayers,
They strongly speak for me.
Forgive him, O, forgive, they cry,
Nor let that ransomed sinner die.

The Father hears him pray,
His dear annointed one;
He cannot turn away,
The presence of his son.

The sentiment contained in these verses is plainly this, that the blood of Christ has atoned for all the fallen sons and daughters of Adam, which expiation is acceptable to God. The wounds from which this precious blood flowed for all our race, utter prayers to God that are effectual, or which effect the object for which the blood was spilled, that is, the salvation of all mankind. For the "Father hears him pray and cannot turn away the presence of his son." The Son prays for sinners, for his persecutors, for all men, and says, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." The Father hears the prayer and forgives, for the hymn says it is "effectual," he "cannot turn away," that is, God the Father who sent his son into the world to save the world, or all men, cannot turn from his purpose. Then the world, or all men, will be saved. Thus much for the truth, or the Universalism, taught in these few verses. And what more could the best and most holy feelings and wishes of the Universalist ask?—Nothing. For it is the plain dictate of Scripture and reason, that Christ "gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time," or according to God's time and purpose, and that "he shall

see of the travil of his soul and be satisfied," "for all flesh shall see the Salvation of God." The Salvation of the world, or of all men, is the Salvation of God. Hymn 183, 1st and 3d verse:

Behold the Savior of mankind,
Nailed to the shameful tree.

'Tis done, the precious ransom's paid,
He bows his head and dies.

The sentiment here is plain—that he who was crucified on Calvary, whom we are directed or exhorted to believe in, is the Savior of all men. That by dying on the cross he finished the work of their salvation, or paid the price required for the salvation of all men, thus becoming in truth the actual Savior of all mankind, or as 192d hymn 3d verse has it;

Atonement he made for every one,
The debt he hath paid, the work he hath done.

In these lines it is affirmed that a complete satisfaction is made by Christ for the sins of every son daughter of Adam, and all that was required to be done by him to accomplish their salvation, is done; so that through his love and power they all will enjoy heaven and happiness. For the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world, and gave him power to accomplish the work; or in accordance with 198th Hymn, 1st 2d, and 3d verses:

Adam descended from above,
Savior and head of all mankind;
The covenant of redeeming love,
In thee let every sinner find.

Our Surety thou alone hast paid,
The debt we to thy Father ow'd,
For the whole world atonement made,
And sealed the pardon with thy blood.

Thee, the Paternal grace Divine,
A Universal blessing gave;
A light in every heart to shine,
A Savior every soul to save.

The sentiment of these verses appears to be, that the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, is not only the head as the first Adam was of all, but is their Savior also, in whom God made a Covenant of redeeming love, for all who died in the earthy Adam. They being without strength Christ becomes their surety and pays their debt, makes reconciliation between God the creditor and the whole of Adam's posterity, who were debtors to him, and by dying on the cross "sealed their pardon," thus placing them in a perfectly justified state, with the gift of eternal life in the knowledge of a Savior, "every soul to save." This is the design and purpose of God, and of Christ's coming into the world, as St. Paul says, "having made known unto us the mystery of his will, which he hath purposed in himself that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things (or all men) in Christ, or as it is expressed in the 1st verse each of the 272d and 476th Hymn:

This, this is the God we adore,
Our faithful unchangeable friend,
Whose love is as great as his power,
And neither knows measure nor end.

Whose mercies over all rejoice,
Through endless ages still the same.

In these last lines the true character of God is described as the Universalist delights to contemplate it. It is the one which gives him constant hope and joy. Hymns 179, 192 and 198 abundantly prove that God is the friend of all mankind, and if he is faithful to the last, and unchangeable, whose love is as great as his power, "and neither knows measure nor end," and "whose mercies over all rejoice, for endless ages still the same;" that is, as long as he exists, his mercies are the same as now, rejoicing over all, then how can any thing take place that would be an endless evil to one of his creatures?

N. S R

Editorial.

TRENTON, N. J.

This city is the capital of the State of N. Jersey, and is beautifully located on the east bank of the river Delaware, 30 miles North of Philadelphia.—The inhabitants have seldom had an opportunity to hear the 'good tidings of great joy.' Br. T. F. delivered a discoure in the State House, about five years ago. Since then, no Universalist publicly preached the Gospel in that place, until Monday evening, 17th inst. By request of Br. S. C. Johnes, of Heightstown, who is a member of the House of Assembly, the writer hereof proclaimed the testimony of Divine truth, in the Legislative Hall—for the use of which we are under many obligations to the Honorable Speaker. A large majority of the members of both houses attended the meetings and not a few of them subsequently acknowledged thei belief of the doctrine. On Tuesday evening the House of Assembly was in Session, and our meeting was held in the Court Room. Many of the members preferred the *Gospel* to the *Law*, and consequently attended the preaching of the word. The congregation was larger than we had reason to expect, and we are confident that 'the word of the Lord will have free course and be glorified.' The seed has been planted, and by the blessing of God it shall be watered, in full confidence that the increase will not be withholden.

Having intimated above that many received the word gladly, it is proper to remark, that to a few the salvation of all men was a saying too hard to bear. One gentlemen, who was formerly high in authority in the state, remarked, that he was in favor of *a red-hot Presbyterian Hell!* Of course he was not in favor of it for himself, nor for his relatives and friends—but only for *the wicked!* Perhaps he argued as did a gentleman with whom I had a conversation about two years ago. He found himself at a loss for *proof* of endless punishment, and closed the argument by saying, 'If there is *not* an endless Hell, *there ought to be one!*'

In Trenton I became acquainted with the only remaining *original* Trustee of the Lombard-st. Universalist Church. Elisha Gordon, Esq. is in his 72d year. He has been a Universalist for 50 years. His mind is firm and clear, and he rejoices in the salvation of the Lord. He related many circumstances connected with the History of Universalism in Philadelphia, which I shall find useful in giving a continuous account of the progress of the sentiment in this region. I am indebted to him and to his lady for many acts of kindness. The Lord reward them according to their works. A. C. T.

LEWISTOWN, PA.

The gentleman of this place who recently addressed me a letter, desiring a visit, is informed that I purpose acceding to the request so soon as circumstances will permit. It is with no small degree of pleasure we receive intelligence of the interest being excited, in different sections of the country, to the testimony of our Lord. The fields are white unto the harvest, but the laborers are few. Nevertheless the truth *will* have free course and be glorified.

We should be pleased to learn that our friend feels freedom to aid (by his exertions) in extending the circulation of the *Messenger* in that region. He will perceive that a controversy is in progress of publication in our columns. The *question* is the most important that can engage the attention of rational beings. A. C. T.

S. R. S.

These are the initials of Br. Stephen R. Smith. formerly of Philadelphia, and now of Clinton, N. Y. They are also the initials of one of our correspondents, resident at Stamford, Conn. Several of our Philadelphia friends have inquired whether Br. Smith has changed his views in relation to punishment. The inquiry was suggested by the communications of 'S. R. S.' which have appeared in the Messenger,—in which communications the doctrine of *future* [limited] punishment is advocated. If the words '*Stamford Conn.*' had been noticed, as appended to the articles referred to, no mistake could have occurred. Hereafter the signature of our Stamford correspondent will be 'S. R. S——y.'

A. C. T.

NEW-HAVEN EXAMINER.

The number of this paper for the 15th inst. came to us in a new form, changed from folio to quarto. Its course is also designed to be different from what it has been, as we are certified in the following from an editorial notice:

"Its character will also be somewhat changed—it has hitherto been necessary to discuss questions of a political nature in our columns, but our feeble exertions being no longer needed, it will hereafter be devoted *exclusively* to moral and religious subjects."

The Examiner is afforded to single subscribers at $1,50 in advance; four copies for $5, or ten for $10. Letters, postage paid, to be addressed Theophilus Fisk, New-Haven, Conn.

THE STANWICH DISCUSSION.

In No. 14 of the present volume we gave notice of the postponement of the Discussion between Br. S. J. Hillyer, and Rev. T. Payne, accompanied by the following Card from the individuals themselves:

We the undersigned, being under the necessity of procuring another house, in which to continue the debate between us, do mutually agree to postpone the discussion indefinitely. When a suitable house can be procured, the public shall have due notice as to time, and place. Thomas Payne,
Shaler J. Hillyer.

Stanwich, Jan. 24, 1834.

Through the active exertions of some of Br. Hillyer's friends the Congregational Meeting House in Stamford was procured in which to renew the Discussion. We are assured that the unreserved assent of the Committee was obtained, and a promise also from the Pastor of the Church, that he should remain neutral—*that he would not oppose it.* On the strength of this, and knowing also that Br. Hillyer was only waiting for Mr. Payne to name the day, and that he had sent word to that effect, we gave notice in the succeeding (15th) number, that the Stamford house was procured, and that the debate would probably commence again in a week or two.

Since this, however, we understand that Mr. Payne declines resuming the discussion in the Stamford Meeting House, alledging as a reason, that some of the Society are opposed to its being thus occupied, and that it will be likely to make difficulty in the Society.

We are extremely sorry to hear that this objection is offered by Mr. Payne, for however satisfactory it may be to himself, there are many who will look upon it in a different light. He should have at least *equal* care for his own reputation in the case, as for the *harmony* of the Stamford Society.

We cannot learn that the Committee have yet *officially refused* to fulfil their promise. We know that Br. Hillyer is ready and anxious to resume the discussion as early as may be convenient, and it strike us that Mr. Payne is called upon even in justice to himself to meet Br. H. there, and then if the Committee refuse to open the house, it is not to be expected that the Disputants will enter it by force; and the blame, if any exists, will then lie at the right door. From what we have heard of Mr. Payne, we cannot persuade ourselves that he will attempt, for one moment, to justify the Committee or members of the Society in their objections to opening the house for respectful investigation of this kind.

The House at Stanwich was unceremoniously closed against them, and since the Stamford House has been obtained, individuals, we understand, have been exerting themselves to the utmost to prevent its occupation. Let this opposition be continued, and what inference can the reflecting mind draw from the circumstances, other than that our Partialist friends in Stanwich and Stamford, *are determined not to open their eyes, for fear they will see the light!* P.

Original.

DOCTRINES.---NO. 1.

Among the many creeds and doctrines which agitate the religious world, it is notorious that their advocates claim the *Bible* as the fountain and basis of them all. Where there is such a diversity of sentiment, doctrines claiming their origin from Heaven that wage an eternal war with each other, the inquiry naturally arises, can they all be true? We propose to try some of the more prominent ones by the following standard: Any doctrine laying just claims to the Bible as its legitimate source, will not *contradict* this repository of Divine truth. If it does, it certainly is not contained in this holy volume. Does a sentiment when viewed in any of its bearings admit that the Deity is changeable, that He is partial or cruel, it bears the impress of the "cunningly devised fables of men," not of the Bible.

Let us take the doctrine of endless misery which is now so prevalent in Christendom, and to doubt which is deemed by many "an abominable heresy," and see if it will abide the test. The Bible testimony is that "God is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works;" "He is without variableness or shadow of turning;" "For I am the Lord, I change not; "His mercy endureth forever;" "God is kind to the unthankful and the evil." The sentiments here revealed do not harmonize with the notion that the ceaseless curse of the Almighty is to pursue some of his creatures through every period of their future existence, nor does that notion agree with the declaration that the Lord changeth not. Some of the advocates of this gloomy doctrine may aver that it does not necessarily convey the idea of God's mutability, but I have heard these words from an able divine, and advocate of the doctrine. "When an individual commits an outrage in society, the whole community raise one simultaneous voice of indignation till the offender is brought to justice; when this is done, peace and harmony are restored. Thus it is in *God's government*. His wrath is treasuring up against the sinner till the day of final doom, when the wicked shall be punished and *complacency* resume the throne of the Almighty." Now we ask does not this fairly imply that God is changeable? that he increases in wrath day by day till it shall have arrived to its proper zenith, ready to burst in all its fury upon the devoted heads of its victims? *then* clemency and mercy resume their seat in the bosom of Deity; He changes from *wrath* to benignity. We contend that as "God is good" *now*, He will ever remain so. Is he "kind to the evil?" He will remain so to all eternity, and sustaining this character, He will punish the erring children of humanity for their emendation, for their good, and not to wreak on them His accumulated vengeance.

Again, We think the doctrine of endless misery makes the Bible contradict itself in another instance, therefore it cannot be of this invaluable volume. This informs us that, "the devil and his works shall be destroyed," the "last enemy death" shall be destroyed, "and God shall be all in all." But what saith this doctrine of men? It informs us that the devil, instead of being *destroyed*, will unfurl the banners of subjugation over a large portion of mankind, that his works, instead of crumbling into nothingness beneath the all-prevailing sceptre of the Son of God, shall forever remain as an imperishable bulwark against the Most High. The trophies of victory shall eternally blazon on the prison-walls of God's immortal enemy!

This doctrine teaches that 'death' instead of being '*destroyed*' and 'swallowed up in victory," shall be a living and an eternal *curse*, whose agonizing pains shall forever feed like a vulture on man's intellectual and corporeal sensibility. It informs us that instead of God's being "all in all," the spirit of the *devil*, revenge, hatred and malice shall be in a vast multitude, causing them eternally to rebel against Heaven, and hurl their curses and execrations towards the Author of their existence. The Bible teaches that at the resurrection *all shall be raised to die no more*, and that "tears shall be wiped from off all faces;" but this doctrine assures us that millions on millions shall come forth to be the prey of "eternal death," and to shed the scalding tears of bitter remorse and anguish to all eternity. Now the question is, would the doctrine we are examining *contradict* the plain declarations of the volume of Divine truth, if it be revealed therein? Brethren, think on these things. H.

CHRISTIAN RESIGNATION.

'Not my will, but thine, O Lord, be done.'

True Christian resignation is unquestionably the hardest lesson the follower of the Redeemer has to learn. Nor can we conceive of one of more importance, To feel at all times and under all circumstances, in which in the providence of God we may be placed truly reconciled and humbly submissive to the will of our Father in heaven, is certainly desirable. Human nature in its best estate, is weak indeed.—The mind that is not stayed on the great Arbiter of events, the righteous Judge of all the earth, is poorly calculated to bear up under the trials and disappointments of this transitory life. Human weakness will often overcome the mind that hopes not firmly in God; a sceptical feeling of discontent and impatience, will at seasons gain access to the human heart, and giving way to these feelings we shall be led to exclaim with one of old—'*My soul is weary of her life*,' Believing that every reflecting mind is convinced of the infinite importance of true resignation to the will of God, let us pass at once to the consideration of the best method of acquiring this valuable lesson, that thereby we may possess peace amidst the conflicting scenes of human life.

To be truly reconciled and submissive in all the vicissitudes and changes incident to our earthly pilgrimage, we must view God as our Father and changeless friend—as that Being who in all his dispensations has in view our good—who though he afflicts does it not willingly, but for our benefit.

2. We should constantly endeavor to cultivate and maintain a spirit of dependence. We should ever delight to hold secret communion with our Father in heaven. To him we should unbosom our desires, and acknowledge our weaknesses; not because he is not better acquainted with our every want than we are ourselves, but to acknowledge our entire confidence in his care.—By cultivating such a spirit, we shall amidst all our afflictions and trials be encouraged by the happy and cheering reflection that all things work together for good to them that love God.

3. We are constantly to remember, that this is not our abiding city, our final home. No; we have one to which we are travelling, whose maker and builder is God. And though the deeps of affliction get hold upon us, and trial after trial overtake us, still we are encouraged by hope divine, to look for better days. And while thick clouds of darkness hover around us, blessings without number may be in reserve. Yes, says the Poet:

> 'Ye fearful saints fresh courage take,
> The clouds you so much dread,
> Are big with mercy, and will break,
> With blessings on your head.'

Thus have I in a brief manner laid before the reader, some of the means of acquiring what is ever to be desired, true *resignation*. And I need not in conclusion speak of its inestimable value, for it must be apparent to every reflecting mind. Let us then strive to give culture to true submission under all the allotments of Heaven; let us cherish the spirit of Jesus, who amid all his trials and sufferings, merged his will in that of his Father in heaven, and quietly submitted to the ignominious death of the cross. And when our days on earth shall end, and wearied nature shall seek her last repose on the dying bed, we shall be enabled in the temper and spirit of our Master to ejaculate in trembling strains, 'Not my will, but thine O Lord be done.' Yea, 'Come Lord Jesus, come quickly.' —*Independent Messenger.*

HOPE.

When philosophers find any sentiment general through all the nations of the earth, and clearly preceptible in every inhabitant of the globe, they are induced to believe by the most incontestible evidence, that this opinion is incorporated in the law of their nature, and that the universality of its influence precludes the supposition of its being induced by the adventitious circumstances of fashion or prejudice. There is not a plainer truth in the whole circle of knowledge than this, that every individual inhabitant of this planet is cheered by hope; consequently this sentiment is the result of their Maker's will, and is given for some purpose. It is obvious from the most superficial remark, that mankind never hope for misery; and it is equally obvious, that this tendency of hope is as unexceptionable as its existence. If all mankind are actuated by the law of their nature to anticipate happiness, and are incapacitated by the constitution of their being from wishing evil to themselves, the only question to be settled is, has God made our race to be mocked and tantalized by their own hopes and heart-delighting expectations? We must admit one of two things; either that God intended to torment us with the disappointment of our hopes, which we could not but indulge from the law of our being, or that all our anticipations of happiness will be fully realized. If he designed to blast our expectations, and we are clearly assured of this fact, we can revere him no more; hence an acquaintance with the truth militates against the adoration of God, and unpeoples the earth of worshippers. But should we grant his intention to bless all with the gratification of their hopes of happiness, and should we receive the asseveration of God in corroboration of this idea; the sincerest homage, the most devout and heart-felt gratitude would inspire the hearts of all with joy and unreserved obedience. As we do not wish any position admitted without proof, we will now adduce our evidence in confirmation of the first point, that God will realize to all their hopes of happiness. David, speaking of the Lord, says, Thou openest thy hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing. We will now produce the oath of God to strengthen that which is already strong. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow; every tongue shall swear; surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength. Thus we discover the harmonious agreement of philosophy and scripture in vindicating the character of God, and in showing the sincerity of his purpose, in giving man an unextinguishable hope of happiness. As hope is the only star that irradiates the sky of this life, that man must possess a most misanthropical disposition, who attempts to obscure its twinkling ray, and envelope mankind in ten-fold midnight. Hope is the only spring of action, the only energizing principle of our being; hence every effort should be made to increase its rational light, and to extend its trembling beam beyond the dark flood of death, and to feed its flame with oil from heaven.—*Bisbe.*

Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1834.

RELIGIOUS NOTICE.

The Communion of the Lord's Supper will be celebrated in the Orchard-st. Church on Sunday (to morrow) evening.

Lecture in Greenwich Church,

Sixth Avenue, foot of Amity-st. Sunday (to morrow,) evening, March 2d, commencing at 7 o'clock Subject, Eccl. xi, 9, 10. Preacher, Mr. Roberts This Lecture is designed for young people.

☞ A lecture may be expected at the Callowhill St. Universalist church every Wednesday evening, commencing at 7 o'clock.

IMPUTATION OF SIN AND INABILITY.

By *imputation of sin*, we are taught to understand that the *guilt* of our first parents is *imputed* or *reckoned* to their posterity; that is their posterity is regarded by God as guilty to the same degree and deserving the same punishment, at the moment of their birth, as though they had personally violated the most sacred of the divine laws, and incurred its most fearful penalties. The doctrine of imputation, revolting as it is, is most clearly stated in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, (Chap. vi, § 3, 4 and 6,) and also in the Saybrook Platform (Chap. vi, § 3, 4 and 6.)

By *inability*, we understand that since the transgression of our first parents, man possesses *no ability* to turn from his evil thoughts and ways to the obedience of God. Or in the language of the creeds just referred to, 'man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation.' See Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chap. ix, § 3, and Say. Plat. do.

We have made the foregoing remarks as introductory to a passage relative to these subjects, from Dr. Porter's Lectures * He was treating of the sources of evidence to which the minister of the Gospel should resort in making out an argument. After insisting on the *Bible* as the first and chief source, and *consciousness* as the second, he mentions *common sense*. Of the power of an appeal to common sense, he gives from Tillotson a very forcible and happy illustration, and after a few remarks, proceeds thus:

"Hence this sort of evidence is peculiarly valuable to the preacher, in repelling sophistry, and in answering objections, that cannot be effectually met in any other way. Such are the cavils with which infidelity has often assailed Christian doctrines, especially as clothed in the obscure terms of scholastic theology. And such are the doubts with which anxious sinners are distressed in seasons of revival. Every one who has had experience in the ministry, knows how deeply such perplexities take hold on common minds; and how difficult it is to obviate them in the best manner. For example, the doctrine of *strict imputation of Adam's sin*, as it has often been represented, seems to such minds, and with good reason, to be plainly inconsistent with the principles of just moral government. It is an axiom of common sense that no one is criminal for an action committed before he was born, or committed, in any case, by another man. Of course, no argument, however specious, can convince a man that he is to be blamed for what Adam did six thousand years ago, and on the other side of the globe. But tell him that, as one of a fallen race, descended from Adam, he is accountable for his own sins, and he sees nothing unreasonable in the statement. And though the force of prejudice may have led him to say, 'I have indeed a sinful heart, but it is one with which I was born, and which my Creator designed me to possess, and therefore it is not my fault;' appeal to his common sense, and he sees how futile is his objection. He knows that he would not allow the weight of a feather to such an apology, from the man who had assaulted his person, or robbed him of his property. He knows that no father excuses a stubborn son, because he has been stubborn from his infancy; and that no court of justice deems a hardened transgressor guiltless, because he has always had an evil heart. The same remarks apply to what divines have called the doctrine of *inability*. Tell impenitent sinners that they have no sort of power to repent, while in the same breath you exhort them to repentance, on pain of eternal misery, and if they have capacity enough to understand your meaning, they pronounce it utterly absurd. Give them what you call conclusive arguments from Scripture and metaphysics; they may be confounded perhaps, but not convinced. And why should it be strange if they feel indignant, when gravely addressed, on the most weighty of all subjects, in a strain that would be mockery if applied to any human concern besides religion." Lec. xi. pp. 137, 138.

Such sentiments from such a school, and from such a man, really excite our surprize. And we cannot but remark that if the doctrine of imputation of sin is thus to be frittered away, we would recommend that the term be entirely dispensed with, as calculated, not to express our meaning, but only to mislead. With Dr. Porter's exposition of the doctrine in question, we have no fault to find. It certainly commends itself to common sense.

The case before us we regard as only another instance of the gradual but rapid change of religious opinion that is silently taking place in the United States. One offensive feature after another in the popular creeds melts away and is gone forever. A few voices may be heard for a little while, lamenting the progress of innovation, and they are hushed into silence, and the subject is forgotten in the onward march of reformation.

Perhaps we shall be pardoned, if we quote from the Andover Creed what relates to the subjects under consideration, and ask the interesting question whether Dr. Porter has made any departure from the spirit of that symbol. Read and judge.

'I believe—that Adam, the federal head and representative of the human race, was placed in a state of probation and that in consequence of his disobedience, all his descendants were *constituted* sinners; that by nature every man is *personally* depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God, and that previously to the renewing agency of the Divine Spirit *all his moral actions are adverse* to the character and glory of God; that being *morally incapable* of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam, every man is justly exposed to eternal damnation.'

Really, if 'no one is *criminal* for an action committed before he was born, or committed, in any case by another man,' and if 'no agument, however specious, can convince a man that he is to be *blamed* for what Adam did six thousand years ago, and on the other side of the globe,' we would thank any individual to inform us how all of Adam's 'descendants were constituted *sinners*' by 'his disobedience,' and how 'every man is justly exposed to eternal damnation'? We confess ourselves unable to harmonize the Dr's language and his creed.

S.

* 'Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching, and on Public Prayer, together with Sermons and Letters: By Ebenezer Porter, D. D. President of the Theological Seminary, Andover.'—A most valuable work just out of the Andover press, and deserving a place in every clergyman's library. To my young brethren in the ministry I take peculiar pleasure in recommending it, fully persuaded that it is worthy of being attentively studied.

[From the Philadelphian of Feb. 20]

To Mr. Abel C. Thomas.

Philadelphia, Feb. 17th, 1834.

Dear Sir—You have distinctly informed me, in the letters already received from you, (1) that in your opinion, we are bound to believe whatever doctrine can be fairly and clearly established by Scripture testimony; (2) that the Bible furnishes no evidence of a punishment beyond the present life; (3) that in the present life God fully and finally recompenses the righteous and the wicked, according to each person's own deeds; (4) that the Bible teaches no doctrine of a *vicarious* atonement; and (5) that the Bible asserts the final holiness and happiness of all mankind in a future state. On each of these points, except the first, we differ in our judgment.

The Bible furnishes much evidence of a punishment beyond the present life, which shall be experienced by all who die without having been born again. This punishment includes their being deprived of the happiness of the righteous in heaven, and all the painful feelings which will be experienced in hell, whatever may be the occasion or the instrumental cause of those pains.

Our Savior says, 'except a man be born again he cannot see——he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' John iii, 3, 5. These words imply, that some men are not in the kingdom of God; that some men have not been born again; and that unless they should be born again they shall forever remain excluded from the kingdom of God. If all men are born again, or will be born again, it was absurd for Christ to frighten men with the idea of their not entering the kingdom of God.

'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' John iii, 16. Here PERDITION and EVERLASTING LIFE are exhibited in contrast. These words clearly teach, that if God had not given his Son, men would all have perished; but that now believers, and believers alone, shall escape perdition and enjoy everlasting life. This corresponds with another saying of Jesus, Mark xvi, 16. that 'he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.' Before his death, Christ asserted the *manner*, the *necessity* and the *design* of it, saying, 'as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.' John iii, 14, 15. If there are none who will remain in unbelief, the threat of perdition was idle, and unworthy the Savior. Had Christ believed the doctrine of universal salvation, it would have been natural for him, to have said, 'he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be saved' Or he might have caused it to be written, 'he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; and all shall believe and be baptised.' This last statement, however, would have been contrary to known truth; for in every past age multitudes have neither believed nor been baptised. Why should Christ say any thing about *damnation* or *perdition*, if it is certain, in his mind, that all will be saved? Why should he have said, 'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?' Matt. xxiii, 33. The *damnation of hell* surely does not mean the *salvation of heaven*: and had Christ, who as God knows all things, known any way of escape from hell for the hypocrites to whom he addressed the interrogation, his interrogation whould have proved himself a deceiver. 'Ye devour widow's houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation.' ver. 14. These same persons Christ accuses of not entering the kingdom of heaven themselves, and of not suffering others to enter.

Would you, Sir, dare to accost Christ and say, 'You knew well enough how that generation of vipers could escape the damnation of hell, and enter the kingdom of heaven! You knew also, that none will be prevented from entering the kingdom of heaven; for all shall enter and be saved.' On the supposition that all are to be saved, one of these vipers might have replied, 'Who will *not* escape the damnation of hell?' Will you attempt to prove that *damnation* does not mean *damnation*, but something tantamount to *salvation?*'

'He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.' Prov. xxix, 1. Here sudden destruction is denounced against some; and it is declared that there is no remedy for that destruction. This passage cuts off all hope from thosewho assert *that there*

is *a remedy*, and a restoration ultimately, to be expected in the future life. If the hardened sinner spoken of is to be destroyed merely in the present life, and then is to be restored to divine favor, the declaration is not true, *that he shall be destroyed without* REMEDY.

I cannot but think this passage in Proverbs refers to the same destruction which Christ spoke of when he said, 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' Matt. x, 28. This is a destruction *after* the dissolution of soul and body; a destruction of the whole man in hell. How, then, say some among you, that there is no hell; or that there is no evil experienced by any of the human family after the present life? If there is no such thing as God's destroying both soul and body in hell—that is in some state after the termination of our earthly course by natural death, we must regard our Savior as resorting to imposition, when he exhorted men to fear unreal objects of dread and alarm. Would any honest person warn a man to fear that which is not to be feared; or to avoid an evil to which none are exposed?

In Ezekiel xviii, 31, 32, God remonstrates with sinners, saying, 'Why will ye die?'——'for I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye.' Natural death, or the dissolution of soul and body is inevitable. It would be mockery to approach a gasping mortal and ask him, why wilt thou cease to breathe? It is of a death that may be avoided; of a spiritual, second, and everlasting death in sin and to all holiness, that Jehovah demands, *Why will ye die?* Had I the sentiments of Universalists I might very lawfully and consistently with myself reply to my Maker, 'Do not trouble yourself to expostulate with me, nor endeavor to excite groundless alarms; for my Lord is well assured that NONE WILL DIE. ALL will be SAVED; and be saved by himself too! Why, then, should he take the trouble to swear by himself, saying, *As I live saith the Lord God I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked!*' Isa. xxxiii, 11.

On the supposition that there is no death after natural death, every such solemn and tender warning of our merciful God must be regarded as a solemn farce. That there is a *second death*, which consists in an everlasting separation from the enjoyment of God and the society of the good in heaven is clearly taught in Revelation xxi, 7, 8. 'He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.'—Here the pen of inspiration has drawn a contrast between the future state of one who overcometh this sinful world, and persons of a different character: but if all men will be saved immediately after leaving the present state of being, there is no second death, and then he who overcometh, and all who die impenitent liars, murderers, idolaters and unbelievers, shall alike *inherit all things;* and none have their part in a state of punishment symbolized by a lake of fire unquenchable. Poetry I know proves nothing; but the sentiment expressed in the last cited text of Scripture is admirably expanded in the following stanzas.

'Far from the utmost verge of day
Those gloomy regions lie,
Where flames amid the darkness play,
The worm shall never die.

The breath of God—his angry breath
Supplies and fans the fire;
There sinners taste the second death,
And would, but can't expire.

Conscience, the never dying worm,
With torture gnaws the heart;
And woe and wrath in every form,
Is now the sinner's part!

Sad world indeed! ah, who can bear
For ever there to dwell?
For ever sinking in despair,
In all the pains of hell!

It is my prayer that you may never have personal experience of the truth of these lines.

Were there no other passage of the Bible on the subject of controversy between us than the parable of the *good seed and the tares*, I should think that sufficient for the refutation of your opinions: for Christ in explaining his own meaning said, 'The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.' Mat. xiii, 38—43. Here our Savior tells us what shall take place in the end of the world: that then there shall be among men two sorts of children—the children of the kingdom of God and the children of the wicked one, the devil; that the children of the wicked one having grown like tares in God's kingdom of this world, the field, shall be gathered out of it—that the glory, honor and happiness of the righteous, who are the children of God, shall then be comparable to the clear shining of the sun; and that the sufferings of those who have done iniquity and have continued tares to the end of the world, are fitly described by wailing, gnashing of teeth, and the tortures that would result from casting persons into a furnace of fire.

All this I believe as firmly as that there is any future state for man; and I affectionately and respectfully, therefore, entreat you, dear Sir, and all who may read our letters, to *flee from the wrath to come* on all who die the second death. Make your calling and election sure, and then while many perish in their sins, you will be glorious with our God.

Other proofs of the future punishment of persons who die unpardoned, and NOT 'meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light,' will be presented, if the Lord permit in some subsequent letter.

Yours respectfully, E. S. ELY.

—

To Mr. E. S. Ely.

Philadelphia, Feb. 22, 1834.

Dear Sir—In attempting to prove any particular doctrine by the Bible, due caution should be observed in the selection of the testimony. Such passages only should be quoted as are supposed unequivocally to prove the doctrine in question. And I have little doubt, that in endeavoring to establish the doctrine of endless punishment, you have cited the passages which to your mind appear most conclusive.

Before I proceed to an examination of your proofs, allow me to observe, that it would not be courteous in either of us to charge the other with a denial of the Scriptures. I am satisfied that our differences in sentiment arise, not from a rejection of the Bible on either hand, but from our different apprehensions of the import of its language. And it should be remembered that my opinions do not more widely differ from yours, than yours do from mine. An intimated charge of infidelity by either party would, therefore, be equally indecorous and unjust.

As it is understood to be mutually conceded that the parties to the discussion accredit the testimony of the Bible, according to their respective apprehensions of its meaning, the simple quotation of a Scripture passage should not be considered sufficient proof of a position. An attempt should, in all cases, be made to show, that the passage establishes the point to be proved.

In proof of endless punishment, you quote John iii, 3, 5—'Except a man be born again he cannot see——he cannot enter the kingdom of God' But you assume that the *kingdom of God* here mentioned appertains to a future immortal existence. This is the point to be proved. LIGHTFOOT, whose general orthodoxy you will not question, says—'That the kingdom of God, or of heaven, are terms convertible in the evangelist, is obvious to every one that will take the pains to compare them; and that by the kingdom of God, or of heaven, is meant the kingdom and times of the Messiah, is so plain, that it needs no argument to prove it. . . . . Speech is there had (John iii, 3,) of Christ's kingdom of heaven upon earth, or the state under Christ.' So also Beza, Whitby, &c.

John iii, 14—16, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world.' &c. That *to perish* does not signify to suffer endless punishment is obvious. 'There is a *just man* that *perisheth* in his righteousness.' Eccl. vii, 15. 'The *righteous perisheth*.' Isa. lvii, 1. 'It cannot be that a *prophet perish* out of Jerusalem.' Luke xiii, 33. You say, however, that *to perish* and to *have everlasting life* are exhibited in contrast. Granted. But in thence arguing the doctrine of endless punishment, you assume that the everlasting life mentioned in the text appertains to a future immortal existence. '*This* is *life eternal* that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' John xvii, 3. 'He that believeth on him that sent me HATH everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is PASSED from death unto life.' John v, 24. 'He that believeth on me HATH *everlasting life*.' John vi, 47. The believer enjoys *everlasting life* in *this* world, and the unbeliever *perishes* in *this* world. The former lives on the knowledge of God—the latter perishes with moral hunger.

Mark xvi, 16. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.' As you apply this passage to a future state, and speak of it in an unrestricted sense, you cannot justly object to being tried by it. 'These signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them, they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' As these signs do not follow *you*, you cannot be a believer, and of course you must be damned, according to your own showing! And if to be damned signifies to be doomed to endless punishment, such must be your fate. But the truth is, the passage, in my judgement, had its fulfilment in the age of miracles. To that age were confined the particular salvation and damnation spoken of, inasmuch as to that age were confined the signs of believers. As to the word *damn*, Dr. CAMPBELL remarks, that in the text it 'corresponds exactly to the English word condemn'—and affirms that the passage has no reference to a future life. So also HORNE. If Jesus had intended to teach endless punishment, he would have said, 'He that believeth and is baptized in *this* world, shall be saved in the *next*—and he that believeth not and is not baptized in *this* world, shall be eternally damned in the *next*.'

Matt. xxiii, 14. 'Ye shall receive the greater damnation.' You have not attempted to prove that this 'greater damnation' signifies endless punishment.—On the parallel passage, Mark xii, 40, PEARCE remarks, 'Rather judgment or punishment; by which is meant, that they should suffer more severely than other sinners, when the Jewish state should be destroyed.'

Matt. xxiii, 33. 'Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell.' You have not attempted to prove that the hell here spoken of is in a future state of existence. You have simply quoted the passage, relying on the prepossession of the reader for the application you desire. Be it known that I as firmly accredit the testimony of Jesus as you can possibly do. The question is simply on the *import* of the testimony. If you can prove that the damnation or punishment of *Gehenna* [the word translated *hell*] was to be inflicted in a future state of existence, I will yield the argument.—But you cannot reasonably expect me to believe your unsupported assertions. I am prepared to meet you in discussion of all that the Bible says about Gehenna. Before you said, 'The *damnation of hell* surely does not mean the *salvation of heaven*,' and before you put the question, 'Will you attempt to show that *damnation* does not mean *damnation*, but something tantamount to *salvation*,' you should have attempted to show from the Bible that damnation means misery in a future state, and that the damnation of hell surely means endless punishment. Let me respectfully entreat you to forbear *assuming* the predicates of your arguments.

Proverbs xxix, 1. 'He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy.' I have frequently been surprized to hear this passage seriously urged in proof of endless punishment. When we say of a man in the last stages of consumption, 'he will certainly die, and that without remedy,'—or of a house enveloped in flames, 'it will certainly be destroyed, and that without remedy'——do we mean that either the man or the house will be miserable in a future state? Solomon says of a 'naughty person,' that 'his calamity shall come suddenly; suddenly shall he be *broken without remedy*.' Prov. vi, 15. Of the 'chief of the priests and people,' it was said, 'They mocked the messengers of God . . . . until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till *there was no remedy;* therefore *he*

brought upon them the king of the Chaldeans, who *slew their young men.*' &c. 2 Chron. xxxvi, 16, 17. The most that can be said of the text and the two foregoing cases is, that death was inevitable—there was no remedy—no escape.

Matt. x, 28. ' Fear not them that kill the body,' &c. The parallel is Luke xii, 4, 5. You remark in effect, that if *your view* of the text be not correct, our Savior exhorted men to fear unreal objects of dread! This is assuming that he taught endless punishment in the passage before us. And it supposes also, that, in your opinion, there is no object of dread beside endless punishment. Whatever be the object of dread mentioned in the text, it is certain that the *disciples* alone are exhorted to fear it! *No such language was ever addressed to any but the* DISCIPLES *of Christ.* Be it noticed also, that whatever is *destroyed* ceases to exist, and of course ceases to suffer or enjoy. Moreover, if *God* be intended by the word ' *him*,' (which is questionable) it should not be forgotten that his *ability* to do certain things is not sufficient authority for affirming that he *will do* them.—He ' is *able* of these stones to raise up children to Abraham,' Matt. iii, 9, but you do not suppose he ever *will* do so. So soon as you present your arguments in proof that *Gehenna* is in the immortal state of existence, and that *there* soul and body *will be* destroyed, I will attend to your reasoning—but I am not willing to rest the controversy on your apprehension of the signification of a text.

Ezekiel xviii. 31, 32. xxxiii, 11. You say, and correctly, that ' natural death, or the dissolution of soul and body is inevitable'—but it does not follow that death by famine, pestilence and the sword was inevitable to the house of Israel—nor that ' a spiritual, second and everlasting death in sin and to all holiness,' is spoken of in the passage referred to. I do not find the word *spiritual* in either of those passages, nor do I find aught said about a ' second and everlasting death.' Nor have you furnished any proof that such a death is intended. And allow me to assure you, that if you ' had the sentiments of Universalists' you would not have the slightest cause to address the Deity in the manner you have stated. As we propose basing our discussion on *proofs*, I shall expect you to furnish your reasons for supposing that ' a spiritual, second and everlasting death' is taught in the cited passages.

Rev. xxi, 7, 8. This passage speaks of ' the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.' You have a very summary method of proving the doctrine of endless punishment. You say that ' here the pen of inspiration has drawn a contrast between *the future state* of one who overcometh this sinful world, and persons of a different character.' Yet you have not so much as attempted to prove that *the future state* is referred to! I do not pretend to know much about the Apocalypse, and must therefore request you to furnish your reasons for supposing that this lake of fire is in the eternal world. In Rev. xix we read of eating the flesh of kings and others—of a battle between the beast and him that sat on the horse and their respective armies—that the beast and false prophet were cast alive into ' *a lake of fire burning with brimstone*,' and that 'the remnant were slain, and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.' I can see no propriety in referring such language to a future state. Nor indeed do I see the propriety of urging so confessedly hyperbolical a book as the Apocalypse in proof of any important doctrine.

As you acknowledge that poetry *proves nothing*, I need not notice the stanzas you have quoted. In discussing the question before us, I wish to have nothing to do with the sallies of poetical imagination.

'The poet's eye, in a fine phrenzy rolling,
Doth glance from earth to heaven, from heaven to earth;
And as imagination bodies forth
The forms of *things unknown*, the poet's pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to *airy nothing*
A local habitation, and a name.'

Matt. xiii, 38—43. In your remarks on the parable of *the good seed and the tares*, you have assumed two important points: 1st. That by the phrase ' end of the world.' is signified the destruction of the *material* world. Are you aware that two words of essentially different signification are each translate *world* in the parable before us? ' The field is the *world*,' (*kosmos.*) ' The end of the *world*,' (*aionos*) On the latter phrase, PEARCE says, 'Rather end of this *age*, viz. that of the Jewish dispensation.' And on ver. 41, 'This is spoken not of what shall happen at the end of the [material] world, but of what was to happen at the end or destruction of the Jewish state' The same phrase occurs in Matt. xxiv, 3; 1 Cor. x, 11; Heb. ix, 26. In the latter it is said that Jesus ' appeared in *the end of the world* [age or dispensation] to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' I need not enlarge.

2d. You assume that the furnace of fire' spoken of in the parable is in the eternal world. You are aware that *Egypt* is called a *furnace*. Jer. xi, 4. And it is said, Isa. xxi, 9, ' He shall pass over to his strong hold for fear, and his princes shall be afraid of the ensign, saith the Lord, whose *fire is in Zion* and HIS FURNACE IN JERUSALEM.' And again, Ezek. xxii, 18—22, ' Son of man the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace. . . . . I will gather you *into the midst of* JERUSALEM. As they gather silver and brass *into the midst of the* FURNACE, to blow the fire upon it to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave you there and melt you. . . . . As silver is melted in the *midst of the furnace*, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof,' viz. in Jerusalem, as in ver. 19.

Moreover, the parable says that ' all things that offend and them which do iniquity' shall be gathered ' *out of his kingdom.*' How could they be gathered *out of it*, if they were never *in* it? And were such characters ever in the kingdom in a future state of existence?

I have thus noticed all the passages you have adduced in proof of endless punishment. I regret having so frequently found it necessary to call your attention to points which you have not attempted to prove. It is presumable that neither of us can quote a Scripture passage of the existence of which the other is ignorant. Nor can either of us quote a passage which the other denies. It is therefore of much importance that the bearing of every passage on the doctrine it is quoted to establish should be clearly pointed out.

As our object is not useless disputation, I shall present only a *few* proofs of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, in each letter—being persuaded that such a course will prevent the confusion that might be consequent on citing a multiplicity of passages.

Colossians i. 19, 20. "For it pleased the Father that in him [Christ] should all fullness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him *to reconcile* ALL THINGS *unto himself*, by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." In my judgment, this passage distinctly teaches the final holiness and happiness of all mankind—inasmuch as it teaches the *reconciliation of all things to God.*

From the language of the text I feel myself authorized to believe and teach, that it as perfectly pleased the Father "to reconcile all things unto himself," as it did that "in Christ should all fullness dwell." And I suppose you do not feel disposed to deny, that he who is reconciled to God must be happy.

If it be objected, as it probably will, that the phrase "*all things*" does not mean *all mankind* but simply *believers*, I reply, 1st. That the reconciliation of believers is specially spoken of in verse 21—And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet *now* HATH *he reconciled.*" This *special* reconciliation of believers cannot justly be supposed to militate against the *universal* reconciliation before spoken of. In 2 Cor. v, 18, 19, we read—"And *all things* are of God, who HATH *reconciled* US [believers] *to himself* by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ *reconciling* THE WORLD *to himself*, not imputing their trespasses unto them." By which non-imputation, I understand, that God did not consider the trespasses of the world any objection to their reconciliation—for he who is sinless *needs* no reconciliation.

2d. In the verses preceding the text, we read as follows: "For by him were ALL THINGS created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: ALL THINGS were created by him, and for him: and he is before ALL THINGS, and by him ALL TH NGS consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in ALL THINGS he might have the pre-eminence"—and then come in the words of the text. In the above quotation the phrase in question is used *five times*—and in each of these instances you allow that the meaning is unlimited. Why then limit the phrase in the declaration, "by him *to reconcile* ALL THINGS *to himself?*" By what rule of interpretation would you feel authorized to urge a limitation in the latter instance, while you acknowledge *universality* in the former?

Phillippians ii, 9—11. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus *every knee* should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that *every tongue* should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." If the phrases "every knee," and "every tongue," do not express *universality*, I am at a loss to conceive what words could be used to convey the idea.

If it be objected, that though all mankind will thus bow the knee and thus confess, many will do it unwillingly, and to their own shame and endless condemnation, I remark, 1st. That nothing like this appears on the face of the text. We are not certified that some will bow and confess willingly, and others unwillingly—nor that some will thus bow and confess to their eternal happiness and others to their endless condemnation. Far from it. In whatever manner, and with whatever feelings, *one* will bow and confess, "*every* knee shall bow and *every* tongue shall confess." 2. The text does not inform us that any will bow and confess that Jesus is Lord to their own endless condemnation—but "*to the glory of God the Father.*" And we read, Psalm l, 23, "Whoso offereth *praise* glorifieth me." And surely endless condemnation would not be subject matter of praise. We further read, 1 Cor. xii, 3, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit."

In concluding this letter, let me affectionately entreat you and all our readers, to receive, believe and rejoice in this gracious testimony. The precious records of Divine love, and the faithful promises of our God, fill my own soul with the peace that passeth understanding. And though I have not the smallest doubt of your final blessedness in Christ, I am desirous that you should enjoy the present happiness of believing in the ultimate reconciliation of all things. Blessed are the people who know the joyful sound. They walk in the light of God's countenance, and thus to walk is heaven.

Respectfully yours,
ABEL C. THOMAS.

P. S. The communication of a Sunday School Teacher, proposing a certain question about Universalism, together with your remarks thereon, shall be noticed in the *Messenger and Universalist* of March 8th. A. C. T.

MISCARRIAGE OF PAPERS.

We have been advised in several instances recently that the 'Messenger and Universalist' is not received regularly. In some cases where 10 or 12 go in one package, the whole are missing. We can only assure our patrons that the blame does not lie at our door. In no instance since the commencement of the paper (now near two years and a half,) have we failed in having all the mail papers in the Post Office of this city by 2 o'clock P. M. on the day of publication, and with the exception of two instances, they have always been in on Friday. We take especial pains in having them done up in strong wrappers, and whenever there is more than one in a wrapper, we tie them up with strong twine in addition to pasting. The fault must therefore be some where in the Post Offices.

We especially desire that in every case where additional sets are forwarded, and the original package should subsequently be received, that subscribers would speedily return one of the numbers, or request the Post Masters to do it, as we shall be compelled to take all possible care of the extra numbers we may have on hand. P.

Sermon to Young Men.

A *Doctrinal Discourse* addressed to young Men will be delivered in the Lombard-st. Universalist Church, to-morrow (Sunday) Evening.—Text—'Take heed and beware of the leaven of the PHARISEES *and* of the SADDUCEES,' Matt. xvi, 6. Preacher, A. C. Thomas. The lower floor of the Church will be reserved for Young Men. Services to commence at half past 7 o'clock.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Danbury Sunday 2d, and in Saugatuck. Sunday 9th March inst.

☞ *For a few Editorial articles, see 3d page*

WEEP NOT FOR HER.

Weep not for her—she was too pure
For such a world as this;
No breath of guilt had dared to mar
Her spirit's holiness;
But, sinless as the golden flowers
That yield their breath in tropic bowers,
Or the bright gems that span the sky,
Her few, but joyous years went by.

Weep not for her—her life was like
Long months of polar light,
That glide in fadeless beauty on,
Undarkened by the night.
She lived not to behold the dearth
Of friendship at the social hearth,
Or, with a crushed and baffled heart,
To bid hope's darling dreams depart.

Weep not for her—she did not die
As those who ne'er have known
The bliss communing spirits feel,
At a Redeemer's throne.
She clung not to the things of time,
Though prospects dawned for her sublime;
For faith revealed a Father's love,
Preparing deathless joys above.

Weep not for her—she passed away
Like music on the sea,
When wave to answering wave imparts,
The dying melody—
Like rainbow hues, that leave the earth,
To seek the fount that gave them birth,
Or the sweet cherub forms which bare
Their bright wings to the lower air.

Weep not for her—the glorious bands
Of Heaven surround her now;
The wreath of immortality
Sits smiling on her brow.
O, rather give thy tears to those
O'er whom long life its shadow throws,
Whose cares, and griefs, and follies must
Weigh down the spirit to the dust. J. H. K.

Universalist.

THE PASSING CROWD.

"The passing crowd," is a phrase coined in the spirit of indifference. Yet, to a man, of what Plato calls "universal sympathies," and even to the plain ordinary denizens of this world; what can be more interesting than the "passing crowd?" Does not this tide of human beings, which we daily see passing along the ways of this world, consist of persons animated by the same spark of the divine essence, and partaking of the same high destinies with ourselves? Let us stand still but for a moment in the midst of this busy, and seemingly careless scene, and consider what they are or may be whom we see around us. In the hurry of the passing show, and of our own sensations, we see but a series of unknown faces: but this is no reason why we should regard them with indifference. Many of these persons, if we knew their histories, would rivet our admiration by the ability, worth, benevolence, or piety, which they have displayed in their various paths through life. Many would excite our warmest interest by their sufferings—sufferings, perhaps, borne meekly and well, and more for the sake of others than themselves. How many tales of human weal and wo, of glory and of humiliation, could be told by those beings, whom, in passing, we regard not! Unvalued as they are by us, how many as good as ourselves repose upon them the affections of bounteous hearts, and would not want them for any earthly compensation! Every one of these persons, in all probability, retains in his bosom the cherished recollections of early happy days, spent in some scene which "they ne'er forget, though there they are forgot," with friends and fellows who, though now far removed in distance and in fortune, are never to be given up by the heart. Every one of these individuals, in all probability, nurses still deeper, in the recesses of feeling, the remembrance of that chapter of romance in the life of every man, an early, earnest attachment, conceived in the fervor of youth, unstained by the slightest thought of self, and for the time purifying and elevating the character far above its ordinary standard. Beneath all this gloss of the world—this cold conventional aspect, which all more or less present, and which the business of life renders necessary—there resides for certain a fountain of goodness, pure in its inner depths and the lymph rock-distilled, and ready on every proper occasion to well out in the exercise of the noblest duties. Though all may seem but a hunt after worldly objects, the great majority of these individuals can, at the proper time, cast aside all earthly thoughts, and communicate directly with the Being whom their fathers have taught them to worship, and whose will and attributes have been taught to man immediately by himself. Perhaps many of these persons are of loftier aspect than ourselves, and belong to a sphere removed above our own. But, nevertheless, if the barrier of mere wordly form were taken out of the way, it is probable that we could interchange sympathies with these persons as freely and cordially as with any of our own class. Perhaps they are of an inferior order; but they are only inferior in certain circumstances, which should never interpose to prevent the flow of feeling for our kind. The great common features of human nature remain; and let us never forget how much respect is due to the very impress of humanity—the type of the divine nature itself! Even where our fellow-creatures are degraded by vice and poverty, let us still be gentle in our judging. The various fortunes which we every day see befalling the members of a single family, after they part off in their several paths through life, teach us, that it is not to every one that success in the career of existence is destined. Besides, do not the arrangements of society at once necessitate the subjection of an immense multitude to humble toil, and give rise to temptations, before which the weak and uninstructed can scarcely escape falling? But even beneath the soiled face of the poor artizan there may be aspirations after some vague excellence, which hard fate has denied him the means of attaining, though the very wish to obtain it is itself ennobling. The very mendicant was not always so: he, too, has had his undegraded and happier days, upon the recollection of which, some remnant of better feeling may still repose.

These, I humbly think, are reasons why we should not look with coldness upon any masses of men with whom it may be our lot to mingle. It is the nature of a good man to conclude that others are like himself; and if we take the crowd promiscuously, we can never be far wrong in thinking that there are worthy and well-directed feelings in it as well as in our own bosoms.

Blackwood.

THE SPIDER.

From the German of Krummacher.

A boy accompanied his father into the vineyard, and there discovered a bee in a spider's web. The spider had began to kill the bee, but the boy liberated the bee and destroyed the web of the spider. The father, who saw it, inquired, "How can you esteem the instinct and the dexterity of this animal so little, as to destroy its web, on which so much skill and labor have been bestowed? Did you not observe with what beauty and regularity the tender threads were arranged; how can you then, at the same time, be so compassionate and yet so severe?" The boy replied, "Is not the ingenuity of the spider wicked, and does it not tend to kill and destroy? But the bee gathers honey and wax in its hive. Therefore I liberated the bee and destroyed the web of the spider." The father commended the judgment of ingenuous simplicity, which condemns the bright cunning that springs from selfishness and aims at mischief and ruin. "But," continued the father, "perhaps you have still done injustice to the spider. See, it defends our ripe grapes from the flies and wasps, with the web which it spins over them." "Does it do this," inquired the boy, "to protect the fruit, or rather to satisfy its own thirst for blood?" "True," answered the father, "they concern themselves but little about the grapes." "O," said, the boy, "the good which they practice without designing it is of no value. A good motive is all that makes a good action estimable and lovely." "Very true!" said the father, "our thanks are due to nature, who knows how to employ what is precious and unfriendly, in the preservation of what is good and useful." Then the boy inquired, "Why does the spider sit alone in its web, whilst the bees live together in social union, and work for general good? Thus the spider ought to make a large common net." "Dear child," replied the father, "many can unite only in noble designs. The alliance of wickedness and selfishness carries the seed of ruin in itself. Therefore wise nature will not attempt what man has so often found impossible and destructive. As they were returning home the boy said, "I have learned nothing to-day from that vicious animal." "Why not?" answered the father. "Nature has placed the malicious along with the friendly, and the evil with the good, that the good may appear lovelier and brighter in the contrast. And thus man can receive instruction even from the vicious."

SELF-LOVE.

Selected for the Messenger and Universalist.

'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'

Self-love, as it is generally called, has been grievously declaimed against, even by religious people, as a most pernicious and dreadful evil. But they have not understood the subject on which they spoke. They have denominated that *intense propensity* which unregenerate men feel to gratify their carnal appetites and vicious passions *self-love;* whereas it might more properly be termed *self-hatred*, or *self-murder*. If I am to love my neighbor *as myself*, and this "love worketh no ill to its neighbor," then *self-love* in the sense in which our Lord uses it is something excellent. It is properly a disposition essential to our nature, and inseparable from our being, by which we *desire* to be happy, by which we *seek* the happiness we have not and rejoice in it when we possess it. In a word it is a uniform wish of the soul to avoid all evil, and to enjoy all good. Therefore he who is wholly governed by *self-love* properly and scripturally speaking, will devote his whole soul to God, and earnestly and constantly seek all his peace, happiness, and salvation in the enjoyment of God. But *self-love* cannot make me happy. I am only the subject which receives the happiness, but am not the *object* that constitutes this happiness: for it is that *object*, properly speaking, that I love, and love not only for its own sake, but also for the sake of the happiness which I enjoy through it. "No man," saith the apostle, "ever hateth his own flesh."—*Dr. Adam Clark.* R.

Familiar Conversations.

Just received and for sale at this office, "Twelve Familiar Conversations between Inquirer and Universalist," &c. &c. By Russell Streeter. Price 50 cents.

Latest News from three Worlds,

Heaven, Earth, and Hell, as reported at a Four days meeting in Shirley, Mass. in letters to eight Calvinistic Clergymen. By Russell Streeter.—Price 25 cents. Just received at this office.

P. PRICE, PRINTER.

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.